



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/827,522 | 04/20/2004 | Yuji Tanaka | L8612.04112 | 2761 |

24257 7590 10/03/2006

STEVENS DAVIS MILLER & MOSHER, LLP
1615 L STREET, NW
SUITE 850
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

MAGEE, CHRISTOPHER R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2627

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/827,522 | Applicant(s) TANAKA ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Christopher R. Magee | Art Unit 2627 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-56 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 17-19 and 28-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 16 and 20-27 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 April 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/11/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: Part Number 32, Figure 7.
3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: Part Number 19j, Vibration Isolation Damper, page 18.
4. Figures 8 and 9 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g).

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement-drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the examiner does not accept the changes, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

5. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: On page 23, lines 3, 13, 21, 23 and on page 24, lines 2, 3, 6 and 10, “pat” should be ~~part~~. Appropriate correction is required.
6. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

- Claims 1, 2, 5-11, 14, 15 and 28-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Watanabe et al. (hereinafter Watanabe) (US 6,111,837).
- Regarding claim 1, Watanabe discloses an optical disk device comprising:
 - a frame (i.e., base) 222;
 - an optical pickup module 205, fixed to the frame 222 [col. 23, lines 39-40]; and
 - a circuit board 251, forming a control circuit fixed to the frame 222 [col. 29, lines 24-40];wherein the frame 222 is provided with fixing parts 222d-f to other members [Fig. 31A].
- Regarding claims 2 and 5-7, Watanabe shows at least a part of the fixing parts 222d-f to other members provided in the frame has a form capable of being screwed 256 [col. 24, line 58 to col. 25, line 17; Figs. 32B and 33].

Art Unit: 2627

- Regarding claims 8 and 9, Watanabe shows at least a part of the fixing parts 222d-f to other members provided in the frame has a substantially planar part and the substantially planar part of the fixing part is substantially parallel and substantially perpendicular to the surface of the frame [Fig. 20].

- Regarding claim 10, Watanabe shows at least a part of the fixing parts 222d-f to other members provided in the frame is provided in the outer peripheral part of the frame [Fig. 20].

- Regarding claim 11, Watanabe shows the fixing parts 222d-f to other members provided in the frame, are disposed at two to ten positions [Fig. 20].

- Regarding claims 14, 33 and 34, Watanabe shows a through hole 222a is provided in the frame 222 and the optical pickup module 205 is attached to the back surface of the frame so that at least a part of the optical pickup module is exposed from the through hole [Figs. 20 and 29].

- Regarding claim 15, Watanabe discloses the optical pickup module comprises:
 - a module frame;
 - a pair of shafts 226, 227, provided in the module frame;
 - a carriage, provided on the pair of shafts so as to be movable and having optical members mounted thereon;
 - a driving unit, provided in the module frame to drive the carriage,
 - a cover, attached to the module frame, and having a through hole and exposing at least a part of the carriage from the through hole; and
 - a spindle motor, attached to the module frame;wherein the module frame is fixed to the frame through a vibration preventing material [col. 23, line 55 to col. 24, line 12; Fig. 29].

Art Unit: 2627

- Regarding claims 28-31, Watanabe discloses a plurality of circuit boards 251, 252a, 252b, 253, are provided and the plurality of circuit boards are separated from each other and fixed to the frame [col. 29, lines 24-40; Fig. 21].
- Regarding claim 32, Watanabe discloses a plurality of circuit boards 251, 252a, 252b, 253, are attached to a back surface opposite to the side of the frame on which the optical disc is mounted [col. 29, lines 24-40; Fig. 21].
- Regarding claims 35-45, Watanabe discloses the plurality of circuit boards are connected together by a flat plate type connecting member 252a, 252b, and the flat plate type connecting member is folded at least once [Fig. 21].
- Regarding claims 46-50, Watanabe discloses a control switch 212 directly or indirectly fixed to the frame is provided [col. 20, lines 20-33; Fig. 19].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

- Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe et al. (hereinafter Watanabe) (US 6,111,837) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Goda (US 5,555,623).

Art Unit: 2627

Regarding claim 3, Watanabe discloses all the features, *supra*, except at least a part of the fixing parts to other members provided in the frame has a form capable of being ultrasonic welded or thermally welded or has the form capable of being fixed by an adhesive agent.

Goda teaches the use of an adhesive or ultrasonic welding when joining parts of an object lens holder in the manufacturing of an optical disk device [col. 14, lines 43-45].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the fixing parts to other members provided in the frame has a form capable of being screwed of Watanabe with a form capable of being ultrasonic welded or thermally welded or has the form capable of being fixed by an adhesive agent taught by Goda.

The rationale is as follows: One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to substitute the fixing parts to other members provided in the frame has a form capable of being screwed of Watanabe with a form capable of being ultrasonic welded or thermally welded or has the form capable of being fixed by an adhesive agent taught by Goda because they are known adhering techniques that are used in the manufacturing of optical disk devices and using them is merely a substitution of art recognized equivalents.

- Claims 12, 13 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe et al. (hereinafter Watanabe) (US 6,111,837) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Saitou et al. (hereinafter Saitou) (US 6,738,334 B1).

Regarding claims 12, 13, 17-19, Watanabe discloses all the features, *supra*, except a lead free material being used for members forming the optical pickup module or the connecting materials of the members, electronic parts forming the circuit board or the connecting materials

of the electronic parts and other members mounted on the frame or the connecting materials of the members and the frame is made of a material including a resin and the weight of the frame is 13g or lower.

Saitou teaches a lens carriage 30 integrally formed of a thermo-soluble resin (i.e., lead-free) [col. 8, lines 27-29]. Saitou also teaches the total weight of the disk drive can be reduced to about 200 g by setting the weights of specific components noted in col. 28, lines 44-65.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the frame and other components of Watanabe with a lead free material and/or resin as taught by Saitou.

The rationale is as follows: One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to make the frame and other components of Watanabe with a lead free material and/or resin as taught by Saitou in order to maintain or improve the reliability and durability of an optical disk drive [Saitou; col. 2, lines 20-23]. Further, Watanabe does not set forth the dimensions as specified in claim 18. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the frame of Watanabe with the claimed dimensions through routine experimentation and optimization in the absence of criticality. More particularly, where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation. *In re Swain et al.*, 33 CCPA (Patents) 1250, 156 F.2d 239 70 USPQ 412; *Minnesota Mining and Mfg. Co. v Coe*, 69 App. D.C. 217, 99 F. 2d 986, 38 USPQ 213; *Allen et al. v Coe*, 77 App. D.C. 324, 135 F. 2d 11, 57 USPQ 136.

Art Unit: 2627

- Claims 51-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe et al. (hereinafter Watanabe) (US 6,111,837) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Sato et al. (hereinafter Sato) (US 6,731,580 B1).

Regarding claims 51-56, Watanabe discloses all the features, *supra*, except a brake member abutting on the outer periphery of a disk fixed and mounted on the frame is separately provided and the brake member is disposed so as to abut on/not abut on the outer periphery of a disk.

Sato teaches the use of a brake mechanism 17 abutting the outer periphery of a disk that brakes the disk when the cover 14 is opened [col. 5, line 65 to col. 6, line 9].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the frame of Watanabe with a brake mechanism taught by Sato.

The rationale is as follows: One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to provide the frame of Watanabe with a brake mechanism taught by Sato in order to stop the disk when the tray is opened [Sato; col. 4, lines 26-29].

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 16 and 20-27 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2627

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon that is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure has been annotated on PTO-492.


11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher R. Magee whose telephone number is (571) 272-7592. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8: 00 am-4: 30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Korzuch can be reached on (571) 272-7589. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


TAN DINH
PRIMARY EXAMINER

9/29/06


Christopher R. Magee
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2627

September 27, 2006
crm